

As a member of the public to which the airwaves ostensibly belong, I object to Sinclair Broadcasting's clear intention to show blatantly biased information about a candidate prior to a national election. It is not in the public's interest to withhold perspectives or information so crucial to our immediate future, and though it may benefit a corporate giant like Sinclair, most people do not want to make a misinformed vote. Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.